REMARKS

Claim 8 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Claims 7 and 8 are pending in this application. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants believe that Claims 7 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7 AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,827 (Coppersmith *et al.*) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0024157 (Hansmann) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,407,388 (Goldman). Applicants note that the Examiner did not cite to any figures or corresponding sections of Hansmann for the rejection of Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), but instead cited U.S. Patent No. 6,779,719 to Guindulain Vidondo ("Vidondo"). Therefore, Hansmann will not be discussed further in this response. Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

The Examiner has not established a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). The Examiner has failed to include: (1) findings of fact concerning the state of the art and the teachings of the references; and (2) explicit findings as to how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the teachings of the cited references, or what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known or could have done in order to render the claimed invention obvious.

Coppersmith discloses a system for transferring data from a transmitter to a receiver by using a user's human body conductance when the user contacts a machine to perform a desired transaction. *See* Abstract. Vidondo discloses a plurality of push buttons in which each push button corresponds to a desired product. *See* Abstract. Goldman discloses a button with a bumper of insulating material. *See* Fig. 2.

Applicants disagree that all the claimed elements in Claims 7 and 8 would be obvious in light of the three cited references, Coppersmith, Vidondo and Goldman. There is no common technical field or common technical problem between the references. There is no

common technical area between the Coppersmith communication system using a human body as a medium and the vending machines or credit apparatuses with buttons of Vidondo and Goldman, respectively. The Examiner has failed to show any motivation or known methods or techniques for combining the references, including explicit findings as to how a person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood the teachings of the cited references, or what a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known or could have done in order to render Claims 7 and 8 obvious.

Applicants disagree that the claimed location of the insulator (*i.e.*, disposed between the conductive pusher and the switch) would be obvious in light of the three references, Coppersmith, Goldman and Vidondo. Even if the references are combined, the combination of Coppersmith, Vidondo and Goldman by a person of ordinary skill in the art would result in a product selection button or push button with a bumper of insulating material that electrically insulates the button from a base station housing. The combination would not result in "an insulator disposed between the conductive pusher and the switch to prevent the electric field induced in the pusher from leaking to the switch" as required by Claims 7 and 8. Goldman discloses an insulating material as a damper, and does not teach or suggest an insulator to prevent leaking of an electric field signal.

None of the references, individually or collectively, teach or suggest a two-step/tier selection process as claimed by Claims 7 and 8, wherein the sales processor regularly sends a connection confirmation packet to inform the wallet manager of the presence of the vending machine, and when the body of the user touches one of the conductive pushers, a communication path is established between the wallet manager and the sales processor via the first transceiver, the body of the user, the conductive pusher, and the second transceiver so that the wallet manager detects the connection confirmation packet sent from the sales processor and sends the electric money information stored therein to the sales processor, and when the body of the user pushes down the conductive pusher, the switch transfers the press information to the sales processor, which determines the commodity selected by the user based on the press information and requests the wallet manager to pay for the selected

commodity. This claimed feature prevents selection malfunctions, such as the body of a user accidentally touching a button (*i.e.*, when the body of the user touches one of the conductive pushers) with no real intention of selecting an item (*i.e.*, no pushing down of the conductive pusher).

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Coppersmith discloses unidirectional communication, wherein the PAN card continuously transmits a signal (not the sales processor), so when a user touches the control panel of a machine the signal passes into the control panel for receipt by the processor. Col. 8, ll. 3-45. Thus in the Coppersmith system there is no prompting or handshaking required. *See* Col. 8, ll. 45. Coppersmith does not disclose or teach a sales processor regularly sending a connection confirmation packet to inform the wallet manager of the presence of the vending machine and the wallet manager detecting the connection confirmation packet sent from the sales processor and sending the electric money information stored therein to the sales processor, as required by Claims 7 and 8. None of the figures or corresponding sections of Coppersmith cited by the Examiner show otherwise. None of the references cited by the Examiner describe a sales processor that regularly sends connection confirmation packets.

Applicants believe that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed insulator and sales processor features as recited by Claims 7 and 8, and submit that Claims 7 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brenda O. Holmes 40339/

By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Date: January 8, 2008